



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

ADDITIONAL NOTES ON 'FRAGMENTS OF A ZADOKITE WORK'

TO THE HISTORY OF THE SECT

WITH a fine display of erudition and much subtle reasoning, Prof. Schechter has put forward, in his Introduction to the work, a plausible theory for the identification of our Sect. The theory may be summed up as follows: The Sect is identical with the Zadokites described by Kirkisani; and at a later stage of its history, it was absorbed by, or amalgamated with, the Dositheans. Now, however useful and interesting the theory may be, it does not carry us very far. It still leaves us in the dark as to the origin of our Sect, its relation to the great historical sects in Judaism, and its place in Jewish history. Kirkisani's knowledge of our Sect, if it be the same as the followers of his Zadok, is derived from the very document under discussion, only perhaps in a fuller form; and as for the Dositheans, we do not yet know for certain who they were, and how, and when they arose.

I believe, however, that our fragments themselves contain material which, if properly sifted and elucidated, will enable us to determine with some certitude the origin of our Sect and its place in the history of Judaism. The text offers us a number of statements which, when rightly interpreted, will yield some very important facts respecting the origin and early history of the Sect. Let me endeavor first to summarize these statements in the order in which they are given in our text, and then to discuss their bearing upon our enquiry.

The Sect arose 390 years after the destruction of the First Temple (p. I, l. 5 ff. שורש is not an individual, but the original party which later developed into our Sect. This is evident from

¹ See *JQR.*, New Series, II (1911), 133 ff.

the words which follow: ... ויבינו הם; ויבינו... etc. We must not, of course, expect an exact chronology from the writer; but the year given by him points clearly to some date in the second century B. C.).

For twenty years (or half a generation), the party remained without a fixed policy and without fixed principles, until God raised up for them the Teacher of Righteousness (p. 1, l. 8 ff.).

But there arose also at the same time the Man of Mockery who led Israel away from the paths of righteousness (p. 1, l. 14 ff.).

The followers of the Man of Mockery persecuted the followers of the Teacher and caused civil war (= ויסיפו לריב עם, p. 1, l. 21); but they fell by the sword (p. 1, l. 17; p. 2, l. 1). The first members of the Sect became disloyal to its Covenant, and fell by the sword (p. 3, l. 10 ff. ... בו הכו באי, etc. This cannot refer to the ancient Israelites, for they are settled with in 11. 8-10).

A number of these first members remained loyal to the principles of the Sect, and they survived the general massacre, and with them God established His Covenant for ever, revealing to them His secrets respecting the Calendar, His commandments, and His will (p. 3, l. 12 ff.).

Even the faithful were not perfect, but God forgave their sins, and established them in an enduring organization (p. 3, l. 17 ff.), under the guidance of leaders who emigrated from Judea, and whose names and histories are still extant (p. 4, l. 2 ff.).

From this time onwards, the Sect must keep itself completely separated from the Jews in Judea (p. 4, l. 10 f.; comp. p. 6, l. 14-15; p. 8, l. 8, 16). He who comes near them, shall not remain guiltless (p. 5, l. 14 f.).

The apostasy began at the end of the desolation of the land (caused, presumably, by the Syrian wars; p. 5, l. 20).

But God raised up wise men who emigrated from Judea to the land of Damascus,² and who dug up the well of the Torah

² i. e. Syria, not the City of Damascus as stated by the editor, *Intro.*, p. XIII. Comp. p. 8, l. 21, 11, 19, 34; 20, 12

by following the rules of the 'Expounder of the Torah' (p. 6, l. 3, ff.).

Those who entered the New Covenant bound themselves, among other promises, not to enter the Jerusalem Sanctuary with sacrifices, but to seek to close its doors, as long as its ritual remained contrary to the teaching of the Sect, 'until the end of wickedness' (i. e. until the resurrection of the Teacher, p. 6, l. 11-14. This seems to me the most probable interpretation of the passage, which I quote here in full: *וכל אשר הובאו בברית לבבלתי בוא אל המקדש להאיר מובחו ויהיו מסגירי הרלת אשר אמר אל מי בכם יסגיר דלתו ולא תאירו מובחי חנם אם לא ישמרו לעשות בפירוש התורה לקץ הרשע*. I supply *נשבעו* before *לבבלתי*, and regard *התורה ... אם* as a parenthesis. This explanation clears up also the meaning of the passage in Text B, p. 20, l. 22 f.: *אשר יצאו מעיר וטמאו את המקדש וישבו עד אל הקדש וטמאו*. *הקדש* has a declarative force, comp. Lev. 13, 3, 8, etc. 'They went forth from the Holy City, and pronounced the Sanctuary unclean, and returned unto God.' N. B. *אשר אמר* = 'כאשר א'; see below note on p. 4, l. 15).

The disloyal members of the Sect were slain by the sword, but those who held fast to its teachings escaped to the land of the North (= Syria, p. 7, l. 13 f., 21 f. || 19, l. 11-13).

The emigration to Syria was effected under the leadership of the 'Expounder of the Torah' (p. 7, l. 18 f.).

Forty years (i. e. a whole generation, comp. Num. 14, 34; Judg. 3, 11, etc.) passed from the death of the Teacher³ to the complete disappearance of the fighting section of the party that followed the Man of Mockery (p. 20, l. 13-15).

During this period the Sect became entirely disorganized and demoralized, until at last its members conferred and reorganized themselves (p. 20, l. 15 ff., comp. the writer's note on this passage *JQR*, New Series, II, p. 139); they left the Holy City

³ *יוריה*; comp. p. 19, l. 35 f.; p. 3, l. 8; p. 6, l. 11. It is noteworthy that *יוריה* occurs as a proper name in I Chron. 23, 19; 24, 23; 26, 31. Is there any connection between the title 'Teacher' and this proper name? Comp. the title *σωτηρ* as applied to Jesus (= *ישוע*).

(= Jerusalem), rejected the Temple as unclean, and returned unto God (*ibid.*, ll. 22, 23. מִבֵּית פֶּלֶג may perhaps be the same as בֵּית מַחֲלֹקֶת 'a place of dissension,' comp. Gen. 10, 25. Note that קֶץ here as often in this document is equivalent to 'period.').

After the Sect had established itself in Syria, some of its members returned to Judea in the company of the followers of the Man of Mockery (p. 20, l. 10 f. רַעִיָּהם, etc.).

Now let us endeavor to appreciate the facts revealed by these statements.

Our Sect was an offshoot of a party which was cruelly persecuted in Judea, and which, to escape this persecution, emigrated to Syria. It is evident that this party must have been formed for the defense of a principle or principles which were uncompromisingly hostile to the ruling powers of Judea. It is also evident that the ruling powers in Syria had nothing to fear and possibly something to gain from the assertion of the party's principles; therefore they allowed the fugitives from Judea to settle freely in Damascene territory, and to organize themselves in the peculiar religious and social organization outlined in our document. It follows, therefore, that the ruling authorities in Jerusalem and Damascus respectively were not only not the same, but that they were actually hostile to each other. In other words, the rise of the combined party and of its offshoot, our Sect, must have taken place in a period preceding the Roman occupation of Judea and Syria, i. e. *our Sect originated in Hasmonean times.*

Now we learn from history that there were two Hasmonean rulers who had to suppress with the sword active opposition to them in Jerusalem, viz. John Hyrcanus and his son Alexander Janæus; and that this opposition was directed against the assumption by these rulers of the office of the High Priest. As the party to which our Sect belonged was persecuted with the sword by the Hasmonean authorities, it follows that the party, and our Sect which originated from it, were probably the opponents of the Hasmonean usurpation of the High Priesthood. And, in fact we find that our Sect held Zadok and his descendants, the rightful heirs of the High Priesthood, in high esteem (p. 5, l. 5; p. 4, l. 3; comp. the editor's Introd., pp. xiii, xxi). And, as we

have seen above, the boycott of the Jerusalem Sanctuary was a necessary condition to the entering into the New Covenant of our Sect. We may, therefore, conclude that the parent body of our Sect was no other than the party that rose up in opposition to John Hyrcanus and demanded that he should restore the office of the High Priesthood 'to the seed of Aaron' (i. e. the descendants of Zadok; comp. b. Kiddushin 66a, where **ינאי המלך** is an obvious error for **יוחנן הוויקנים**). This party must have contained many heterogeneous elements. There must have been in its ranks the members and dependents of the old disinherited Zadokite families, and the descendants of the former Hellenistic enemies of the Maccabees—soon known as *Sadducees*; then the moderate teachers of the Law and their followers—the *Pharisees*; the extreme Pietists or *Hasidim* who in a former generation had welcomed the Zadokite Alcimus against Judas Maccabaeus; and finally members of the Apocalyptic circles and other sectarians. These conflicting elements were for a time held together by their common aim to bring about the restoration of the Zadokites to their priestly dignities. But dissension soon broke out within the mixed ranks of the party. The Sadducees betrayed the cause by going over to the Hasmoneans. The remaining elements were divided by their divergent religious doctrines and practices. One leader, styled in our document the Teacher of Righteousness, or the Only Teacher, went so far in his opposition to the official priesthood, as to urge the complete rejection of the Temple, its ritual, its Calendar, and the whole established religious polity maintained by the Hasmoneans—all of which was based on Pharisaic principles. Another leader, styled in our document 'The Man of Mockery⁴ or of Lies,' who, no doubt, had the majority of the Party behind him, strenuously opposed the extreme fanaticism and the schismatic tendencies of the 'Teacher.' And

⁴ This title would suit admirably the Sadducees who were known for their mockery; comp. p. Hagigah 3, 5; Abot derabbi Nathan 5; Matthew 22, 23 ff. But from the assertion in our document that the followers of the Man of Mockery suffered heavily in the massacre, it is evident that the term refers to the Pharisee leader. As our text is, however, merely an abstract of a larger work, it is also possible that a confusion has arisen in the abstract between the **אנשי לצון** or Sadducees, and the **בוני החוץ**, or Pharisees, both of whom were opposed to our Sect.

then broke out the ruthless suppression of the Party, whose members were slaughtered by the sword (comp. the Baraita in *Kiddushin* cited above; Josephus, *Ant.* XIII, 10, 5 f.; *Wars* I, 2, 8). It is possible that the Teacher, whose death is referred to in our document, was slain in the massacre. And having become a martyr for his doctrines, he was invested by his followers with Messianic attributes (p. 6, l. 10 f.; 2, l. 12; 20, l. 1, etc.). After a whole generation of bloody persecution and complete disorganization, there arose the *דורש התורה* or the *מחוקק* (p. 6, l. 7, 9.) who organized the remnants of the Teacher's adherents and emigrated with them to the land of Damascus, where they were received cordially by its Seleucid rulers, as enemies of the hated Hasmoneans, and where they established themselves in towns and villages (= camps) in accordance with the principles of the Teachers, and on a constitution evolved by the *מחוקק*.

But the members of our Sect were not the only Judean fugitives who made their way to Syria. Other victims of the Hasmonean persecution also fled to Syria just as to Egypt.⁵ Among them were followers of the 'Man of Mockery' who carried over into their new home their antagonism to our Sect, and induced many of its members to leave it. This explains the fierce denunciations of apostates, and the threats of human and Divine vengeance against them, to be found in our document (p. 8, l. 1 ff.; l. 4 ff.; 18 f.; p. 19, l. 13 f.; 16 ff.; p. 20, l. 8, 25 f.). It also explains the fierceness of temper pervading throughout the hortatory parts of the document. At a later stage, we gather from an incidental remark (p. 20, l. 10 f.), the 'Man of Mockery' returned to Judea accompanied by members of the Sect.

The text supplies us also with dates which enable us to determine approximately the chronology of the history of the Sect down to the composition of the original work upon which our fragments are based. We are told that the Teacher arose twenty years after the formation of the parent body from which our Sect originated (p. 1, l. 10). Further that forty years elapsed from the death of the Teacher to the final suppression of the

⁵ e. g. Joshua b. Perahiah in the time of Hyrcanus (b. *Sotah* 47a) and Judah b. Tabbai in the time of Jannaeus (p. *Ḥagigah* 2, 5; comp. Isaac Halevi, *Dorot Harishonim* I, p. 476 f.).

Sect (p. 20, l. 14, f., 17 [= **ינ**] f., 22 f.⁶). Taking these figures to stand for half a generation and a whole generation respectively, we obtain an interval of a generation and a half between the formation of the original party of opposition to the Hasmonean High Priesthood, and the emigration of our Sect to Syria. We may assume that the opposition party was formed at the beginning of the rule of Hyrcanus (= 135 B. C. E.). Nay, it is even possible that this opposition arose already in the lifetime of Simon, and that his murderer Ptolemy counted upon support from this opposition party, when he sent to seize Jerusalem and the Temple (I Maccab. 16, 20; cf. also Halevi, *l. c.*, p. 390). If so, then the Teacher arose in the middle of the rule of Hyrcanus (135-105 B. C.), say after 120 B. C. Allowing a few years for the activity of the Teacher, his death must have occurred towards the end of Hyrcanus' rule, when the struggle broke out between the Hasmonean High Priest and the opposition party (comp. b. Berakot 29a). The emigration of the Sect to Syria occurred a whole generation later, i. e. toward the end of the reign of Jannaeus (104-78 B. C.), when the latter had secured his final triumph over his Jewish enemies in the civil war (Josephus, *Ant.* XIII, 14, 2), say c. 85 B. C. The return from Syria to Jerusalem of the 'Men of Mockery' with members of our Sect, would therefore have taken place in the peaceful reign of Salome Alexandra (78-69 B. C.). And the composition of the original work upon which our fragments are based seems to belong to the year 63 B. C., when Pompey was setting out from Damascus to invade Jerusalem. For it is this first Roman conqueror of Judea who seems to be in the mind of the writer when he says **הוּא רִאשׁ מַלְכֵי יוֹן הַבָּא לַעֲשׂוֹת בְּהֵם נִקְמָה** (p. 8, l. 11 f.; p. 19, l. 23 f.). The writer may have actually been an eye witness of the suit brought by the sons of Jannaeus before Pompey in Damascus, and of the subsequent march of the Romans from Syria to Jerusalem.

⁶ It may be pointed out here that the whole of this undoubtedly original and very important passage, beginning **וּמִיּוֹם** (p. 20, l. 13), and ending with **אֵל** (l. 24), is not in its right place, as it disturbs the connection of the preceding and following passages, both of which deal with the fate of apostates.

NOTES ON THE TEXT

- P. 1, l. 19. **ויבחרו בטוב הצואר**. The editor suggests to read **בטוב העובר**. But the text seems to be correct, as it is a reminiscence of Hosea 10, 11. 'They chose *sleekness of the neck*,' i. e. they preferred worldly comfort to righteousness. Comp. Ps. 73, 7; Job 15, 27.
- P. 2, l. 6. **בו**. The text would be greatly improved if we read **בִּיד**: 'But power and might and great wrath ... *by the hand* of all angels,' etc.
- L. 9 ff. I suggest to read as follows: **וַיֵּדַע (= ויודע) את שני מעמדם**, and to transfer the whole sentence **עולם ... וידע** to line 12 after **מזרעם**; comp. p. 4, l. 4 f. Further, to regard **משיחו רוח קדשו** (l. 12) as in apposition (comp. p. 6, l. 1), and **והוא אמת** (l. 12-13) as a parenthetical ejaculation by the writer to insure the belief of the reader; comp. Dan. 8, 26; 10, 1; 11, 2; Apocalypse of John 19, 9; 21, 5; 22, 7. I would thus translate the whole passage as follows: (l. 8: **ויתעב**) "And He contemned *their* generation" till they were consumed. (l. 11 **ובכולם**) But in all these wicked generations He raised up for Himself men called by name to fill the face of the world with their seed. (l. 9 **וידע**) And He has made known the years of their station and the number of their sufferings and the explanation of their periods unto all that will exist throughout eternity. And the *happenings of eternity*⁷ (sc. He has made known), what will occur in their periods throughout all the years of eternity. (l. 12 **ויודיעם**) Yea, He has made them known through His Anointed, even the Anointed of His Holy Spirit (and it is true!); and also the explanation of their names⁸ (sc. He has made known). But those whom He hated He led astray" (comp. Ezek. 20, 25).

The passage is thus somewhat parallel to p. 4, l. 4 ff. From the latter passage it is evident that the writer pos-

⁷ **דורותיהם**; comp. the writer's note on the passage in this REVIEW, New Series, II, p. 133.

⁸ See the last footnote.

⁹ **שמותיהם** and **ופירוש שמותיהם** as emended by the editor.

sessed a work containing a list of the leaders of the Sect and a history of their lives and works. But from our present passage, it would appear that that work began with a history of the Teacher, written probably in the first person, and continued down to the time of our author, and hence our author regarded the work so possessed of a prophetic character. **קריאי שם** may perhaps mean the office of the **מַעֲמַד**; comp. Isa. 22, 19; I Chron. 23, 28; and also the expression **מַעֲמַד אֲנִשִּׁי**, Mishnah Ta'anit 2, 1, etc.

- P. 4, l. 2 **שְׁבִי יִשְׂרָאֵל**. The editor reads **שְׁבִי** 'the captivity of,' and further suggests that it may be pointed **שְׁבִי** 'the repentants of.' I believe the right reading is **שְׁבִי** 'the Elders of' (comp. Job 15, 10. Note also the spelling in l. 11 and p. 7, l. 13). The writer interprets **הַכֹּהֲנִים** figuratively as 'chiefs or elders' (comp. II Samuel 18, 18; Ps. 110, 4). This reading seems to me proved by the statement in p. 6, l. 6 of **אֲשֶׁר קָרָא אֵל** **אֶת כּוֹלָם שְׂרִים — שְׁבִי יִשְׂרָאֵל**.

- L. 9. I suggest to insert **לְמַסְפָּר** after **הַקֵּץ**, as in the following line. This would remove the grammatical difficulty of the Text.

- L. 15. **אֲשֶׁר אָמַר** read **כִּאֲשֶׁר א'**; comp. p. 6, l. 7 f., 13; p. 8, l. 9, 14 (= **וְכִאֲשֶׁר א'**); p. 19, l. 11, 26 (= **וְכִאֲשֶׁר א'**). This slight emendation removes the difficulties from all the passages cited.

- L. 16. I take **וַיִּתְּנֵם פְּנִיָּהֶם** (better **וַיִּתֵּן**) to refer, like **בָּהֶם**, to the three nets, the meaning being that 'he (= **הוּא**, Belial) set up these three nets in opposition over against the three virtues' (= **מִיָּנֵי הַצַּדִּיק**). The three virtues seem to have been so well known that they required no special mention. The second suggestion of the editor on this passage is rendered untenable by the use of the verb **תָּפַשׁ** in l. 18, below.

- L. 20. **בְּשֵׁתֵי נָשִׁים**. The editor regards this as anticipatory of **בְּשֵׁתֵי נָשִׁים**. But this is altogether improbable and unnecessary. The word simply means 'by two' of the three nets, viz. fornication and pollution of the Sanctuary (p. 5, l. 6). The **בּוֹנֵי הַחֹץ** are not specially accused of robbery. P. 6, l. 15 only gives the promises made on entering the New Covenant, and we

should supply there ולהנזר before ולהנזול; comp. above p. 303.

P. 7, l. 5. יסודי ברית ברית. I would emend יסודי הברית ברית. 'In accordance with all the *Foundations of the Covenant*, then the Covenant of" etc.; comp. p. 10, l. 6 and the editor's Introd., p. xvi.

L. 21. הפקודה הראשון—The massacre of the parent body of the Sect of the Hasmoneans, as opposed to the 'second visitation' at the Resurrection of the Teacher; comp. p. 8, l. 2 f.; p. 19, l. 14 f. and particularly l. 10.

P. 8, l. 8. ולא נזרו מעם—viz. from the bulk of the Jews. Contrast l. 16 below, and cf. p. 4, l. 11. As is proved by the more correct text in B (p. 19, l. 16), the whole passage beginning here with line 4 is directed against apostates from the Sect. But owing probably to some defect in the text, the denunciation against apostates passes into a denunciation against the original opponents of the Sect (l. 12 f.).

L. 13. ... אשר. The editor translates as if this was the substance of the false prophecy. It is better to take the words as a causal clause (יען אשר = אשר). ואשר in the next line = וכאשר (comp. above note on p. 4, l. 15), the writer desiring to prove the sinfulness of his contemporaries from the words of Moses.

L. 20-21. נערו הוא. This is evidently a gloss which disturbs the context, as seen from the parallel in B, p. 19, l. 33. Other glosses occur in p. 4, l. 19 (הצו יטיפן); p. 5, l. 17-19 (כי בה ... ובשבועותיהם); p. 16, l. 2-4 (בו הראשונה). They belong to some student of Apocryphal Midrashim. In l. 21 we must supply כן before כל from B, p. 19, l. 33.

P. 9, l. 1-2. I believe that הוא belongs to the preceding להמית, and that the following ואשר with the verse quoted, forms an introduction to the new law which is derived from this verse. Such introductory verses are also found below in l. 8-9 and in p. 16, l. 6, f. Line 1 will therefore read as follows: 'Any man who will devote a man by the statutes of the Gentiles, he is to be slain.'

- L. 14. The מפקר must have been originally the officer entrusted with the examination of charges against members of the Sect, and also with the examination of neophytes and repentants; comp. p. 13, l. 11 ff.; p. 15, l. 10 f. Gradually, however, his powers and influence extended, until he became the direct ruler of the community. The office of the מפקר is thus of native origin, and has no connection with the Roman Censor (as supposed by the editor, Introd., p. xxiii, note 41).
- P. 10, l. 11, 13. מרעיל. The editor emends מטביל, but this emendation does not give a smooth text; nor is it likely that the error would have been repeated within two lines, especially in the case of such a well-known word. I would suggest to retain מרעיל and to translate 'wrapping or covering up'; comp. רעלות 'veils' Isa. 3, 19; רעלות, Mishnah Shabbat 6, 10.
- P. 11, l. 12. ימרא. The editor translates 'provoke.' The exact meaning seems to be 'stir up, encourage' to work; comp. ממרין את היונים b. Shabbat 25b; see Rashi and Kohut, s. v.
- P. 16, l. 14-15. מאכל אחיו ל...ל. Read perhaps מאכל אחיו ל...ל. It may be that according to the rules of the Sect, a man could render the consumption of his neighbor's food unlawful by dedicating it to some holy purpose; hence the prohibition in the text. According to Rabbinic law one could not dedicate another man's property. Mishnah 'Arakin 8, 5. Perhaps ל...ל stands for לגוי.¹⁰

¹⁰ I may perhaps be allowed to correct here a *lapsus calami* in my first article (*JQR.*, New Series, II, p. 133-4). I stated that the expression ער לא in our text is an Aramaism. As a matter of fact, it is also found in biblical Hebrew (Proverbs 8, 26). Our text is then entirely free from all *direct* Aramaic influence.